



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

cases since its organization in 1902. The Second Hague Conference voted by a large majority the project of an International Court of Justice, although, as is well known, it failed to realize on account of the difficulties incident to the problem of its composition. The idea of a Council of Investigation and Conciliation for dealing with non-justiciable questions—those, indeed, which are most likely to lead to war—has developed from the commission of inquiry established by the First Hague Conference. Finally, to look forward to the development of the Hague Conference into an international assembly, meeting periodically to formulate and codify rules of international law, coincides with the spirit of the Second Hague Conference in providing for the calling of the third.

Besides urging the consideration of those principles of durable peace which should govern the peace-settlement congress, and the plan for international organization, the Central Organization for a Durable Peace believes that the stability of peace will never be maintained wholly through measures of international order. In speaking of the limitations of international law, Mr. Root said: "Law cannot control national policy, and it is through the working of long-continued and persistent national policies that the present war has come. Against such policies all attempts at conciliation and good understanding and good will among the nations of Europe have been powerless." The program mentions two measures in this domain which are especially indispensable: (1) the guarantee to the national minorities of civil equality, religious liberty, and the free use of their native languages; (2) the parliamentary control of foreign politics with interdiction of all secret treaties.

The most striking part of the minimum-program, and that which offers a great departure from present international procedure, is the provision for an international treaty, binding States to refer their disputes to an arbitral or judicial tribunal or to the Council of Investigation and Conciliation, and further to use concerted diplomatic, economic, and military pressure against any State that breaks the treaty. According to this plan, we find developed a World League of Peace, which, if supported by a strong public opinion, can come into existence through the action of the world congress to convene after the war. This should be called through the machinery of the Hague Conference. The organization of this League of Peace should not be deferred until all States are willing to sign the treaty. When a number of States of sufficient importance to make the league effective become signatories, it should be declared organized. But the league should always remain open; it ought, above all, to avoid the character of a political alliance; it ought to be, and ought always to remain, a League of Peace.

The aim of the Central Organization for a Durable Peace is to form national groups in all countries to make a technical study of the proposals laid down in the minimum-program. Nine research committees have been organized, representing the nine points of the minimum-program. Some thirty-five research studies, including nine prepared by members of the American committee, have already been published. These are now used by the various national groups as a basis of technical study and discussion, and, after final editing, they are to be sent to the governments of the world.

In estimating the importance of this work, one has only to mention the names of those who are taking part in it. Among those who have prepared research studies are Dr. W. H. de Beaufort, Ex-Minister of Foreign Affairs; General De Meester, and Ex-Prime Minister Heemskerk, of Holland; Ex-Minister Adelswärd, of Sweden; Prof. Dr. H. Lammasch, Member of the International Court of Arbitration, and Dr. Alfred H. Fried, of Austria; G. Lowes Dickinson, Arthur Ponsonby, Charles Roden Buxton, Dr. J. T. Lawrence, and John A. Hobson, of England; Prof. João Cabral, of Brazil; Professor Altamira, of Spain; Halvden Koht and Chr. L. Lange, of Norway; Professor Michels, of Italy; Professor Stauning, of Denmark; Prof. André Mercier, of Switzerland, and Prof. Dr. W. Schücking and Dr. Hans Wehberg, of Germany, not to mention our own distinguished group.

Through these study groups, which now represent twenty-six nations, this organization is building up a united support of the underlying principles of equitable law, and is thereby destined to become a world factor in influencing the great settlement. The effort demands the support of the world. The people of one nation alone, or of a group of nations, cannot effect a new world order; it is a task for the civilized world. The work of the Central Organization for a Durable Peace may be described as a simultaneous world study to prepare for action at the supreme moment of the world's history which we shall witness after the war. This moment will call for high statesmanship—a statesmanship freed from bias, resting its action on legal principles, and motivated by the desire to establish the eternal laws of justice and humanity.

## THE NEUTRAL CONFERENCE FOR CONTINUOUS MEDIATION AT STOCKHOLM

By LOUIS LOCHNER

(The following is a condensation of a report submitted by Mr. Lochner, and is published at his request.)

### *Organization.*

At the first informal meeting of the Neutral Conference on February 10, 1916, only the American and Swedish representatives were present. By February 15 representatives of Denmark and Norway had also arrived. On February 28 came the Swiss, and the Dutch on March 3. Continuous meetings were then held until April 15, when the final draft of an appeal to governments, parliaments, and peoples of the belligerent nations was completed and given to the public.

### *The Appeals to Neutrals and Belligerents.*

From the very beginning the members of the conference deemed one of their most important duties to be that of urging constantly upon the neutral governments the desirability of joint mediation. An appeal to the neutral nations represented at the Second Hague Conference, importuning them to call an official neutral conference, was therefore drafted and completed by the

middle of March, at which time the foreign ministers of the three Scandinavian governments met in Copenhagen. To this meeting a deputation from the conference was sent to present this appeal. It was received by the Danish Secretary of State in the name of the three Scandinavian governments and entered upon the official minutes. Official recognition was thus for the first time given to the Neutral Conference.

The reply of the President of the Storting was especially significant. He stated his sympathy with the object of their visit and consulted the vice-president of the Storting. They agreed that the appeal should be laid before the Parliament.

One direct result of the appeal was the fact that Mayor Lindhagen, of Stockholm, one of the Swedish delegates, introduced a bill in the Second Chamber of the Riksdag, urging the Swedish government to take the initiative in calling a Neutral Conference. The bill passed the lower house unanimously and secured a substantial vote in the upper house. A similar bill is now pending in the Norwegian Parliament. The question of a governmental Neutral Conference will also come up in the spring session of the Swiss National Council through the efforts of several Swiss members of the conference. In Holland our friends of the Anti-Oorlog-Raad are constantly working on their government.

Even more important is the publication of an appeal to the governments, parliaments, and peoples of the belligerent nations, which occupied the attention of the conference from the beginning of March to the 15th of April. As six languages were constantly used, and consequently much time was consumed for interpretation, it is not surprising that the document in its final form perhaps does not disclose to the uninitiated what labor was spent in harmonizing conflicting points of view.

The appeal to the belligerents represents an honest attempt to initiate a discussion of peace terms among belligerents and neutrals alike. The proposals put forward are not submitted dogmatically, but rather in the hope that from their discussion throughout the belligerent world some rational basis of agreement may ultimately emerge. The members were well aware that in putting forward concrete proposals they would lay themselves open to criticism on both sides. At the same time they realized that some one must make a beginning, even in the face of criticism foreseen.

The publicity given the document exceeded the expectations of the most sanguine members of the conference. Not only was it published in full in the neutral countries—a fact not to be underrated when one considers the scarcity of paper in Europe during the war—but its publication was permitted in Austria, Germany, Great Britain, Italy, and Russia. Such important papers as the "Berliner Tageblatt," "Vorwärts," and "Novoye Vremya" published the full text, with editorial comment. The interesting thing in this connection is that newspapers of the Entente assert the document to be violently pro-German, while the press of the central powers is no less emphatic in charging the conference with being pro-Ally.

#### *Creation of a Central Committee of Twelve.*

After the two appeals had been completed and published the conference resolved to reorganize and consti-

tute a permanent working committee of twelve members, two from each of the six neutral nations, to direct the work of mediation, publicity and propaganda, and scientific inquiry. It was found that the cumbersome body of almost thirty delegates was too unwieldy for quick, decisive action such as is necessitated at a time when twenty-four hours may bring about a complete change on the international horizon. This central committee will therefore sit hereafter at Stockholm, or such other city as may become the future seat of the conference, and will remain in intimate touch not only with the remaining members of the conference who have returned to their respective countries, but also with the peace movements throughout Europe and with such international bodies as the Esperanto and Ido Societies, the International Socialist Bureau, the Central Organization for a Durable Peace, the Cooperative Association, the International Council of Women, the Trade Unions, the Interparliamentary Union, and the like.

The members of the central committee and their alternates are:

#### DENMARK.

##### *Delegates:*

Kristoffer Markvard Klausen, Town Councilor, Socialist Member of the Danish Parliament.  
Professor Fr. Weis, author and publicist.

##### *Alternates:*

Miss Helene Berg, candidate for Danish Parliament and noted publicist.  
A. F. Lamm, banker and civic worker in Copenhagen.

#### HOLLAND.

##### *Delegates:*

Mrs. Bakker van Boss, lawyer, Member of the Executive Council Anti-Oorlog-Raad.  
Dr. Walter Beek-Müller, Professor of International Law at the University of Rotterdam.

##### *Alternates:*

Dr. B. de Jong van Beek en Donk, General Secretary of the Dutch Anti-Oorlog-Raad (Anti-War League).  
Henri van der Mandere, Secretary of the Society "Vrede door Recht" (Peace through Justice).

#### NORWAY.

##### *Delegates:*

Dr. Nikolaus Gjelsvik, Professor of International Law at the University of Christiania.  
Rev. Eugene Hansson, Member of many peace movements and prominent in social work.

##### *Alternates:*

Dr. Michael Lie, Professor of the Science of Law at the University of Christiania.  
Mr. Ole Solnørdal, General Secretary Social Radical Party of Norway.

#### SWEDEN.

##### *Delegates:*

Carl Lindhagen, Socialist Member of Parliament; Mayor of Stockholm.

Dr. Hans Larsson, Professor of Philosophy at the University of Lund; Leading Member of the Liberal Party.

*Alternates:*

Dr. Ernst Wigforss, Professor at the University of Lund; Member of the Municipal Board.  
Redaktör Johan Hansson, Social-Reformer and Journalist.

SWITZERLAND.

*Delegates:*

J. Scherrer-Füllemann, *Nationalrat* from St. Gallen; President of the Swiss Group of the Inter-parliamentary Union.

Dr. Emil Göttisheim, *Nationalrat* from Basle; prominent Barrister.

*Alternates:*

William Rappard, Professor of Economics at the University of Geneva.

Dr. F. Bucher-Heller, President of the Swiss Peace Association; Judge at Lucerne.

UNITED STATES.

*Delegates:*

Dr. Charles F. Aked, Clergyman and Publicist.

Miss Emily Greene Balch, Professor of Political and Social Science at Wellesley College.

*Alternates:*

John D. Barry, Journalist and Author.

Mr. Frederick H. Holt, of Detroit, acts as the representative of Mr. Ford in charge of the business administration, and the writer as General Secretary of the Neutral Conference.

*Demonstrations on May 18.*

May 18 was centered upon as an objective for concrete action. It will be remembered that it was on May 18, 1899, that the First Hague Peace Conference was convened. On this anniversary of that epoch-making event simultaneous mass-meetings were arranged by the conference in scores of cities throughout neutral Europe and the United States for the twofold purpose of urging the neutral governments to convene an official conference for mediation and to work for a world conference at the close of the war. The following resolution was everywhere adopted, with slight modifications to meet local conditions:

"We urgently request the parliament and government of our country to take all necessary and possible measures to call a conference of neutral nations or to urge one neutral nation,

(a) to tender the belligerents their good offices for mediation, and

(b) to call a general conference of the nations of the world for the discussion of an international organization of justice and for the settlement of disputes concerning general, territorial, economical, and legal questions."

No doubt the most impressive of the meetings was that held in the city in which the conference sits—

Stockholm. Every one of the 1,800 seats in the vast auditorium was occupied long before Chairman Lindhagen introduced Sweden's political leader, Redaktör Branting. An overflow meeting was arranged for at the near-by Victoria Hall, but even from that large meeting place hundreds had to be turned away. The speakers from six nations who assisted were greeted with thunderous applause.

All Stockholm participated in the festivities, and over the House of Parliament the Swedish flag was hoisted in honor of the occasion. Some 50,000 narcissus were sold as peace flowers by students from the University of Stockholm for the benefit of the non-combatant population of Belgium, Poland, and Lithuania.

*Special Appeals.*

A delegation from the conference is about to visit the Vatican. It will be remembered that both Cardinal Gibbons and the Papal Apostolic Delegate at Washington were visited by Mr. Ford and the General Secretary just before the sailing of the "Oscar II," who were given every assurance of the sympathy of these two prelates. The delegation to the Vatican will seek to bring about mutual cooperation in the efforts of the Pope and of the Neutral Conference for peace.

Georg Brandes, the Danish man of letters, and Dr. Otto Borngräber, the Swiss-German poet and publicist, were secured by the conference to write each an appeal for peace which might be used for propaganda among the masses. Both submitted stirring indictments of war, which will be circulated by the publicity and propaganda division of the conference, not as utterances subscribed to by the conference, but as personal views expressed by the distinguished authors whose signatures they bear.

*Future Lines of Activity.*

The work will now follow three main lines. The first of these will be mediation. Not only will envoys be sent wherever feasible into the belligerent countries to ascertain as fully as possible the mind of the countries at war, but the conference will also try to bring together under its ægis personalities of influence from both belligerent groups—men not in official life, but enjoying desirable connections with government circles. Men thus brought together unofficially to "talk things over" cannot but exert an influence upon their surroundings that will slowly make for mutual understanding among the belligerents.

Secondly, the work of publicity and propaganda will be extended and amplified.

Thirdly, there must necessarily be a certain amount of scientific inquiry and study. By this we do not mean that the members are to abandon their program of activity and assume the functions of a study congress. Rather will the members delegate this work to the few within their midst especially trained for it, and will invite men of learning to submit expert testimony on which scientific data is required.

The work of the conference is obviously barely begun, but it is markedly gaining respect and confidence. It occupies a unique position as the only international body actively endeavoring to help end the war. Every mail

brings suggestions for future work, often from the most unexpected quarters. It is a constant source of inspiration to the members to note how governmental personalities vie with the man in the street in offering constructive suggestions.

## THE ROAD TO A MORE LASTING PEACE

By EDWARD A. FILENE

(The Editors of the Advocate of Peace are glad to give space to independent personal expressions of opinion such as the following, even when these do not express the views of the American Peace Society. It is hoped that in the discussion aroused by such definitely expressed views truth may be advanced.)

THE editor of the ADVOCATE OF PEACE has asked me to state my conviction of the duty that the present international crisis imposes upon the United States as the largest of the nations not actually involved in the war. I am glad to do this, for my conviction is clear.

Sane thinking on the period of reconstruction that will follow the war is fundamental to our thinking on all political, industrial, and social problems, because all of the important things of the future are going to be influenced by this war. Had humanitarian and ethical impulse been totally absent, still my own business interests would have driven me to a serious consideration of the probable situation at the end of the war and the policies that should then dominate in order to give the nations of the world some measure of relief from the fear of another war and, therefore, a chance to turn their energies to the normal problems of civil and industrial life. All of the problems of future business prosperity, of social welfare, and of the advance of democracy will hang in the balance until some practical method is found for making wars less probable and peace more permanent.

With a reasonably fire-proof building and an efficient fire company in my city, I should as soon think of going without fire insurance for the next few years as to fail to do all in my power to aid in finding some solution to the problem of more stable international relations.

If the present war is settled as all other wars have been settled, leaving no method but war for the settling of the inevitable disputes that will arise between nations, then the nations of Europe will be compelled to add to their enormous war debts and the expense of the normal rebuilding of their industries the continuous and increasing expense of an intense rivalry in armaments, as a preparation for the next conflict. If such a situation obtains, the United States will be forced, whether she wills it or not, into an abnormal increase in armaments and an increased militarization of her national ideals.

My contention, stated briefly and without detailed argument, is this:

The present international situation imposes upon the United States the following duty, which, if assumed, will not only guarantee our self-preservation, but will make it possible for us to make a contribution to a very fundamental advance in civilization. This duty may be stated from two angles. It is the clear duty of the United States to put her army and navy in a state of

adequate preparedness. The outstanding lesson of this war is that so long as autocratic governments back their claims by force, the more democratic governments dare not trust for protection merely to their superior ideals. If democratic ideals are superior, we are not justified in taking any risk about their safety. Force without ideals is dangerous, but ideals without force are too often powerless. We have not yet reached a point where an ideal will stop a bullet. We cannot afford to live in a fool's paradise, and think that because we are a democracy we are safe. The more valuable our ideal, the more important it is to protect it adequately.

The question involved in preparedness is not whether it is right or wrong to use force. The question is, Shall force be used to destroy democratic civilization or to support it?

But this war has also proved that when nations pile up armies for the sole purpose of defense, sooner or later a conflict of national interests arises, and with a ready weapon at hand it is easy to yield to the temptation of war. There is little doubt that if we had had a good fighting machine at the time of the sinking of the *Lusitania* an aroused public opinion would probably have insisted that we use our power in defense of our rights. There is no doubt but that if preparedness is not based upon a far-seeing policy, in every provocation a nation is tempted to try out its power.

For this reason, I am convinced that a program of preparedness will not succeed, and probably should not succeed, unless it is based upon a proposal that our military force shall be used not only as our arm of defense, but also as our contribution toward helping to keep the peace of the world. In other words, I think that the success of any program of preparedness, as well as our duty to civilization, demands that the United States should take the lead in advocating an international program under which the nations of the world should abandon the system of rival group alliances and should create instead an alliance of all of the civilized powers pledged to use their combined power as a collective guarantee of each against aggression.

At the close of the war the public opinion of America should be educated and unified to a point where it will support the Government of the United States in advocating the establishment of an International Court and Council of Conciliation, supported by a League of Nations, agreeing to use their combined power to enforce every nation to submit its disputes thereto for examination before proceeding to make war, this combined power to be used first in the form of a system of financial and commercial non-intercourse which would bring about automatically the complete isolation from the benefits of international civilization any nation that refused to submit its disputes for examination before going to war, and that in the event such economic pressure proved ineffective, the nations of the league should use their combined military power to enforce submission to the court or council.

Not only should the expressed support of the United States to this proposal be in existence at the end of the war, but we should strive to have the nations of Latin America behind the proposal.

If, at the end of the war, the United States and the States of Latin America stand ready with such a proposal, I am convinced that there is a reasonable chance